

AUG 19 2010

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/563,211	ULLRICH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sheela J. Huff	1643	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Sheela J. Huff (3) _____(2) Aydin H. Harston #65,249 (4) _____Date of Interview: 5/6/10Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: all pending claimsIdentification of prior art discussed: all art to recordAgreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's agent presented arguments and cited WO9/40134 to show that antibodies to HB-EGF inhibit proliferation both in vitro and in vivo
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

In vivo. The Examiner will reconsider the enablement of "antibodies" based on this. Agent also presented arguments w/ respect to other types of inhibitors and showed correlation between in vitro and in vivo using siRNA and EGFR. The Examiner was concerned with the claims being directed to inhibition of ligand vs. the reference showing agents acting on receptor. Agent will address this in his arguments. Agent will also reiterate arguments w/ respect to other ligand inhibitors.

//Sheela J Huff//
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1643

Aydin H. Harston

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
PTOL-413 (Rev. 04-03)

Interview Summary

Paper No. 20100508